

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action, Claims 1-36 were examined and are rejected. In response to the Final Office Action, Claims 1, 2, 4-12, 15-21, 26, 31 and 34 are amended, no claims are cancelled, and no claims are added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of pending Claims 1-36 in view of the following remarks.

I. Objection to the Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings for failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. §1.84(p)(4) because reference characters “350” and “358” have both been used to design “LINK MANAGER” on amended paragraph 57. In response, Applicants have amended paragraph [00057] to replace the reference to link manager, such that link manager is amended to as “link manager 350.”

Accordingly, in view of Applicants’ amendment to paragraph [00057], Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the drawings.

II. Objection to the Specification

The Examiner has objected to paragraph [00064] on page 15 of the specification for failing to define the term “API”. Applicant has amended paragraph [00064] in accordance with the Examiner’s request and therefore requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the specification.

III. Objection to the Claims

The Examiner has objected to Claim 20 for a minor informality. Claim 20 has been amended in accordance with the Examiner’s request. Accordingly, in view of Applicants’ amendment to Claim 20, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection to Claim 20.

IV. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner has rejected Claims 4 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicants respectfully submit that the compression of the audio identification information and the generation of the hash value from the compressed audio device identification information is described with reference to paragraph [00076] of Applicants’ specification, as filed. Applicants respectfully submit that the description

provided at paragraph [00076] of page 23 of the application, as filed, describes the subject matter recited by Claims 4 and 14 in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains or to which it is most nearly connected to make and/or use the invention.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse the 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph rejection of Claims 4 and 14 and request that the Examiner withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph rejection of Claims 4 and 14 based on the description provided at page 22, paragraph [00076] of Applicants' specification, as filed.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 4 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps.

Regarding Claims 1 and 11, Claims 1 and 11 are amended to replace references to "the detected device" with -- the detected wireless device -- . Accordingly, in view of Applicants' amendment to Claims 1 and 11, Applicants respectfully submit that such amendments overcome the antecedent basis issue previously indicated by the Examiner.

Regarding "the received audio device identification information" feature recited by Claim 4, as well as the admitted step of receiving audio authentication initialization information from the detected device, Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants have amended Claim 2 to recite receiving audio device identification information from the detected wireless device to provide antecedent basis for references to "the received audio device identification information".

Accordingly, in view of Applicants' amendments to Claims 1, 4 and 11, Applicants respectfully submit that such claims, as amended, particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, which Applicants regard as the invention. Therefore, in view of Applicants' amendment to Claims 1, 2, 4 and 11, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, rejection of Claims 1, 4 and 11.

V. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-20 and 31-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Specification of the Bluetooth System*, Version 1.1, February 22, 2001 (“Bluetooth”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,718,172 issued to Cook et al. (“Cook”) and further in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0129264 issued to Rowland et al. (“Rowland”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Regarding Claims 1 and 11, Claims 1 and 11 are amended to recite the following claim features, which are neither taught nor suggested by the combination of Bluetooth in view of Cook and further in view of Rowland:

authenticating the detected wireless device based on the requested audio authentication initialization information; and
storing, by the host device, one or more of a device identification code and a device personal identification number of the detected wireless device as device identification information to enable subsequent authentication of the detected wireless device.

According to the Examiner, Bluetooth teaches the above-recited feature of storing, prior to the above amendment. (See, pg. 6, first ¶ of the Final Office Action April 11, 2006.) As taught by Bluetooth, the authentication key of the detected wireless device is exchanged between the detected wireless device and a host device using an initialization key to perform link key exchange. (See, §14.22 at pg. 152 of Bluetooth.)

Conversely, amended Claims 1 and 11 recite that one or more of a device identification code and a device personal identification number of the detected wireless device are stored as device identification information to enable subsequent authentication of the detected wireless device. Accordingly, as recited by Claims 1 and 11, authentication of a detected wireless device by a host device may be performed according to one or more of a device identification code and a device personal identification number (PIN) rather than a shared authentication key, as taught by Bluetooth.

As mandated by case law, to establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all of the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).

Here, for at least the reasons indicated above, Bluetooth teaches the authentication of a detected wireless device using knowledge based on a shared authentication key, which may be exchanged during an initial communication using an initialization key. (See, §14.22 of Bluetooth.) The Examiner cites both Cook, which according to the Examiner teaches voice

authentication, and Rowland, which according to the Examiner teaches the switching of authentication techniques based on authentication failure.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's citing of Cook and Rowland fails to rectify the deficiencies of Bluetooth in failing to teach or suggest the storage of one or more of a device identification code and a device personal identification number of a detected wireless device as device identification information to enable subsequent authentication of the detected wireless device. As recited by Claims 1 and 11, the detected wireless device is authenticated according to requested device identification information, which, as recited by Claims 1 and 11, may be performed according to one or more of a device identification code and a device personal identification number.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants' amendments to Claims 1 and 11 prohibits the Examiner from establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness of Claims 1 and 11, since the prior art combination of Bluetooth, in view of Cook and further in view of Rowland, fails to teach or suggest all claimed features recited by Claims 1 and 11, as amended. Id.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons provided above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 11, as amended, are patentable over the combination of Bluetooth in view of Cook and further in view of Rowland. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claims 1 and 11.

Regarding Claims 2-10 and 12-20, Claims 2-10 and 12-20, based on their dependency from Claims 1 and 11, respectively, are also patentable over the combination of Bluetooth in view of Cook and further in view of Rowland. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claims 2-10 and 12-20.

Regarding Claim 31, Claim 31 is amended to recite the following claim feature, which is neither taught, disclosed nor suggested by the combination of Bluetooth in view of Cook and further in view of Rowland:

a storage device coupled to the authentication unit, containing an audio authentication initialization token as well as one or more of a device identification code and a device personal identification number as device identification information for at least one wireless device initialized by the apparatus to enable subsequent authentication of the initialized wireless device.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 31, as amended, recites analogous claim features to Claims 1 and 11, as described above. Specifically, the storage unit stores one or more

of a device identification number and a device personal identification number as device identification information to enable subsequent verification of the various devices. Conversely, Bluetooth teaches that authentication is performed based on knowledge of a shared authentication key.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons provided above, Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants' amendment to Claim 31 prohibits the Examiner from establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness of Claim 31, since all claim limitations recited by Claim 31 are neither taught nor suggested by the prior art combination of Bluetooth in view of Cook and further in view of Rowland.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 31, as amended, is patentable over the combination of Bluetooth in view of Cook and further in view of Rowland. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claim 31.

Regarding Claims 32 and 33, Claims 32 and 33, based on their dependency from Claim 31, are also patentable over the combination of Bluetooth in view of Cook and further in view of Rowland. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claims 32 and 33.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 21-30 and 34-36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bluetooth in view of Cook. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Regarding Claims 21 and 26, Claims 21 and 26 are amended to recite the following claim features, which are neither taught nor suggested by the prior art combination of Bluetooth in view of Cook and further in view of Rowland:

once the audio authentication initialization information is authenticated by the host device, providing the host device with one or more of a device identification code and a device personal identification number of the wireless device as device identification information to enable subsequent authentication of the wireless device.

Applicants respectfully submit that the providing of one or more of the device identification number and the device personal identification number (PIN) to enable subsequent verification of the wireless device by the host device recites features, which are neither disclosed, taught nor suggested by Bluetooth. As previously indicated, Bluetooth teaches that authentication is performed based on knowledge of a shared authentication key, which is exchanged between devices using an initialization key. (See, Bluetooth, *supra*.)

Accordingly, for at least the reasons provided above, Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants' amendments to Claims 21 and 26 prohibit the Examiner from establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness of Claims 21 and 26, since all of the claim features recited by Claims 21 and 26 are neither taught nor suggested by the prior art combination of Bluetooth in view of Cook and further in view of Rowland. Id.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 21 and 26, as amended, are patentable over the combination of Bluetooth in view of Cook. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claims 21 and 26.

Regarding Claims 22-25 and 27-30, Claims 22-25 and 27-30, based on their dependency from Claims 21 and 26, respectively, are also patentable over the combination of Bluetooth in view of Cook. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claims 22-25 and 27-30.

Regarding Claim 34, Claim 34 recites the following claim feature, which is neither disclosed, taught nor suggested by the prior art combination of Bluetooth in view of Cook:

once the audio authentication initialization information is authenticated by the host device, providing the host device with one or more of a device identification code and a device personal identification number of the wireless device as device identification information to enable subsequent authentication of the wireless device.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above-recited feature of amended Claim 34 is analogous to the previously-recited feature of Claims 21 and 26. Accordingly, Applicants' arguments provided above with regard to the §103(a) rejection of Claims 21 and 26 equally apply to the Examiner's §103(a) rejection of Claim 34.

Therefore, for at least the reasons provided above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 34, as amended, is patentable over the combination of Bluetooth in view of Cook. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claim 34, as well as dependent Claims 35 and 36.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that Claims 1-36, as amended, patentably define the subject invention over the cited references of record, and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would be useful in moving the case forward, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (310) 207-3800.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR, & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: July 11, 2006

By: 

Joseph Lutz, Reg. No. 43,765

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
Telephone (310) 207-3800
Facsimile (310) 820-5988

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted electronically via EFS Web on the date shown below to the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

Nedy Calderon
Nedy Calderon

7/11/06

Date